

REMARKS

Claims 4, 5, 7-9 and 12-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 4, 5, 7, 8 and 12-14 are amended, and claims 1-3, 6, 10, 11 and 15-20 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Support for the amendments to claim 4 can be found at least in original claims 1-3. Support for the amendments to claim 12 can be found at least in original claims 6, 10 and 11. Claims 5, 7, 8, 13 and 14 are amended solely to correct their dependencies. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. By this Amendment, claims 16-20 are canceled thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114027 to Horimai. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 15-17 and 20 are canceled thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Claims 5, 7-9, 13 and 14 are amended to variously depend from claims 4 or 12, each of which the Office Action acknowledges contains features not disclosed by Horimai.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 15, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horimai in view of "New Laser Pattern Generator for DUV Using a Spatial Light Modulator," to Ljungblad et al. (hereinafter "Ljungblad"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applied references fail to disclose or render obvious "dividing an original image displaying the biometric information into a plurality of pixel blocks, said pixel blocks being composed of a plurality of and the same number of pixels," as recited in independent claim 4 and similarly recited in independent claim 12.

The Office Action acknowledges that Horimai fails to disclose this feature. However, the Office Action alleges that Ljunbglad cures this deficiency of Horimai at page 24, paragraph [0003] and page 26, paragraph [0001]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Page 24, paragraph [0003] of Ljunbglad discloses a CMOS circuit having a number of address electrodes. Ljunbglad further discloses dividing the CMOS circuit into several individual column blocks, each column block having 32 columns contained therein. Thus, Ljunbglad discloses merely dividing the circuit into several column blocks such that each column block is located under an address electrode of a cell. However, these blocks are not composed of individual pixels, but rather a number of columns, as discussed above. Thus, Ljunbglad fails to disclose the above-quoted feature of independent claim 4.

Ljunbglad also fails to disclose "detecting the number of ON pixels or OFF pixels in each pixel block," as recited in independent claim 4. In particular, as discussed above, Ljunbglad discloses a number of column blocks containing columns. Ljunbglad is only able to individually address each of these columns and is not able to individually address each individual pixel contained within those columns. As a result, it is impossible for Ljunbglad to detect the number of ON pixels and OFF pixels in each pixel block. Therefore, Ljunbglad fails to disclose the above-quoted feature of independent claim 4 and similar feature of independent claim 12.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of references fails to disclose or render obvious "dividing an original image displaying the biometric information into a plurality of pixel blocks, said pixel blocks being composed of a plurality of and the

same number of pixels, and detecting the number of ON pixels or OFF pixels in each pixel block," as recited in independent claim 4 and similarly recited in independent claim 12.

Therefore, independent claims 4 and 12 are patentable over Horimai and Ljunbglad. Claims 5, 7-9, 13 and 14 are patentable at least for their various dependencies from the independent claims as well as for the additional features they recite. By this Amendment, claims 3, 11, 15, 18 and 19 are canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Eric D. Morehouse
Registration No. 38,565

JAO:LCS/amt

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 19, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|